



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

reality permanent is evident from the fact there are eight judges who have sat in three or more of the fifteen cases and one judge who has sat in seven of the fifteen cases.

"The conference desires again to affirm its belief in the desirability of such legislation by Congress as will confer upon the courts of the United States jurisdiction over all cases arising under treaty provisions or affecting the rights of aliens."

These Mohonk Conferences are rich opportunities for advancing valued friendships, mutual understandings and sympathies. The atmosphere of genuine hospitality, furnished so abundantly and with such delicate and unstudied courtesy by Mr. and Mrs. Smiley, naturally colors and directs the speech and conversation of the guests. The place is beautiful, the occasion significant. Dr. William T. Harris once said that a person who studies Latin fifteen minutes will never be the same person again. Attendance upon one Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, with its *cameraderie* and good will, leaves an indelible impression that international peace is desirable and attainable. To have attended one of them means the attainment of an additional spiritual asset, enduring and worth while. The twenty-second of these conferences was fully worthy of its place in the long and inspiring series.

### THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY BEFORE CONGRESS

ON March 13 last three representatives of the American Peace Society appeared before the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives and pleaded for two specific things, namely, a program of preparedness in terms of international organization and, secondly, for the resolution to which we have heretofore referred, known as the Shafroth amendment, an amendment which prevents the expenditure of money under the appropriation should an international court render "unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments."

The naval appropriation bill was agreed upon by the House Naval Affairs Committee on Thursday, May 18, the seventeenth anniversary of the beginning of The Hague Conference. The bill includes the Shafroth amendment exactly as recommended by this Society. Furthermore, it includes a resolution introduced by Mr. Hensley, of Missouri, and adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

"Upon conclusion of the war in Europe, or as soon after as it may be done, the President of the United States is authorized to invite all great governments of the world to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of proposing an organization, court of arbitration, or other body to which questions of disagreement between nations shall be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement and to consider the question of disarmament and to submit their recommendations to their respective governments for approval."

The resolution further authorizes the appointment of

nine men to represent the United States in such conferences and appropriates \$200,000 for their salary and all expenses.

Whether or not these two important features of the naval bill prove acceptable to the House and to the Senate, it is encouraging that the two proposals of this Society have been found unanimously acceptable to the committee. They may be designated as two concrete results following the work of the American Peace Society. Whatever the fate of the armament appropriation bills, these two amendments, which contain nothing that is hostile to the national welfare, and much that may be helpful to the international welfare, including our own, should be passed.

### EDITORIAL NOTES

#### Obstacles in the Way of Peace.

We are frequently asked, Why does President Wilson do nothing to bring about peace? Why isn't the American Peace Society trying to stop this war? The people who ask these questions seem to ignore the world situation. Great Britain, France, Russia, and Italy feel that peace at this time would at best be but a return to the conditions that existed before the war. This would mean to all intents a victory for Germany. There have been no proposals by one side in any sense hopeful or agreeable to the other. The entente powers consider that the central powers have reached the maximum of their ability in men, munitions, and other resources, while they themselves are just approaching their greatest strength. The central powers reverse the situation and are still hopeful that they will defeat the entente. Russia has not yet opened the road to Constantinople, and is unwilling, therefore, seriously to consider any peace proposals. France hopes not only to turn to her own advantage the terrible and unsuccessful attacks upon Verdun, but believes that, with the aid of British soldiers, she will yet turn the German right flank and force a retreat to German soil. Even in case of a military deadlock or stalemate, the entente allies have great hopes that, with the continued more or less effective blockade by the British fleet, the commercial breakdown of the central powers will soon follow. In any event, it is neither clear that there is to be a deadlock nor that an early peace can possibly be durable.

Neither side has asked the President of the United States to offer his aid. There is no reason, therefore, for repeating the friendly offer of mediation presented by the President early in the history of the war. It is reasonable to presume that the one man in all the world most anxious to help in the establishment of the peace is Woodrow Wilson. To urge him to mediate can do no harm, but it seems to us that it can do little good.

The American Peace Society can do nothing to stop this war. This is a fact, and a fact is a fact. This is no confession of impotence. The work of the peace societies has only begun. The call for action is immediate. We have duties to perform, here and now. But to attempt to stop this present war is not one of our duties, for it is never a duty to be quixotic.

**Lord Bryce on War and Progress.**

In his recent Huxley Lecture at Birmingham University, England,

Viscount Bryce discussed the question how far war and peace have respectively contributed to the progress of mankind.

The speaker pointed out that those who study the general principles that guide human conduct and the working out of those principles in history find two main streams of tendency, one showing itself in the power of reason and of the finer and more altruistic emotions, while the other tendency is associated with passion and those self-regarding impulses which seek and obtain their ends in and by physical force. It is from out the cleavage of these two principles that we have two distinct schools of philosophical thinkers and historians, one stressing the former tendency as the source of human progress, the other the latter.

This certainly is the analysis of the situation facing the world today. It analyzes the situation facing the United States. The question is whether all progress is or is not achieved by strife.

As Mr. Bryce points out, some of the leading races and States have no doubt established their position by war, but the races which have been most engaged in fighting have not been those that have advanced most. Progress may have been advanced by competition, but social progress has been chiefly advanced by thought; and thought is not helped by war. The races that know how to think lead the world. Invention and scientific inquiry have given us improvements in the arts of life which bring wealth and comfort. It is thinking that produces literature and art and civil liberties. A study of history will enable us to dismiss with an easy conscience the theory of Treitschke, that war is a medicine which Providence must be expected constantly to offer to the human race for its own good; and we may properly apply ourselves at the end of the war to the task of trying to help forward the progress of mankind, not through the strifes and hatreds of the peoples, but by our friendly co-operation "in the healing and enlightening works of peace."

We have in the expression of such views additional evidence of the greatness of the man Bryce. A neutral, speaking in a neutral country, might be expected to express such views; but Mr. Bryce delivered his address in England, and his England is now at war.

**A United Church and Universal Peace.**

There are evidences that the church is awakening at last to its duty in the present world situation. The Reverend R. J. Campbell, frequently called the most popular preacher in England, asks if it would not be possible for the Christian forces of the world to combine after the conclusion of peace for the common purpose of preventing a recurrence of this terrible strife. If we cannot unite upon anything else, surely we might unite upon this one practical object. Dr. Campbell suggests that the Pope is the proper person to summon such an assembly. He cites as precedent for such a proceeding the Council of Trent in the middle of the sixteenth century, to which Protestant delegates were invited, albeit they refused to come. Surely it ought to be possible to concentrate at least the energies of Christendom upon putting an end of warfare between self-called Christian States. When the present devastating struggle is over, a chastened Christian church should be in the mood to listen to some such proposal. Indeed, it seems reasonable that a united church could be "prepared" at once for just such high purposes. Somehow a conscience must be breathed into international politics. The material interests of States are not the only interests; and yet the political world, so far as co-operation is concerned, is ahead of the religious world. States other than Christian co-operate; but the Christian churches have not yet been able to co-operate among themselves, to say nothing of co-operating with non-Christian sects. There is infinite pathos and suggestion in Dr. Campbell's inquiry, "We want the deliberate and sustaining co-operation of all who count themselves followers of the Prince of Peace. Shall we ever get it?"

**State Militia or a Continental Army?**

THE objections to the continental army plan are many. It is no criticism of the patriotism of our American men to venture the belief that no sufficient number of them will voluntarily spend the time and money, in the midst of the most productive season of the year, for two months of drilling in camps. If sufficient numbers should, however, so volunteer, the necessary officers would have to be drawn from the regular army, which is said to be quite impracticable. The details of equipment, the purchase, storing, transporting, packing and repacking for the temporary camps without regular headquarters would be most disproportionately expensive. There could be no continuity of organization or of staff leadership. Such an undertaking would require, and for a short period only, a most elaborate clerical force. Involving, as it must, no State or local pride in its organization, it would soon fall flat. There will have to be a radical change in American ideals before any consider-

able numbers will in times of peace waste their time in military camps.

The case for the State militia has even graver weaknesses. There are now upon the pay-roll of the United States Government over half a million employees. The ordinary running expenses of the Government are increasing each year by nearly \$200,000,000. The plan to subsidize the State militia means the addition of 280,000 persons to the national pay-roll, persons who, remaining in their own communities, following their business as usual, taking their customary parts in party politics, will divide among themselves in the neighborhood of \$75,000,000 of the Government funds. Speaking of this situation, Senator Borah, of Idaho, in an important speech delivered recently in the Senate, said:

"If we are to judge the future by the past, it (this sum) will increase from year to year with remarkable strides, a cost which will be enlarged from year to year by the interest and activity of this large number of men who, without charging any bad faith or any improper motives, will nevertheless be interested in building up their strength and widening their power and accentuating their influence."

Later he quite appropriately added: "We may put sufficient dynamite in this preparedness program to cause later its entire destruction."

Any adequate program for preparedness must have those elements of permanence which are based only upon a sustained public opinion. It must stand the test of experience, and be based upon history and judgment. The federalized State militia plan is not so based. It will inevitably subordinate the civil to the military power. The present State militias have already in practice and principle established military courts above civil courts; at least they did so in West Virginia, and tried to do so in the State of New York. To federalize the National Guard would be a most unnatural step in a Saxon civilization. In any event, it would be one long stride toward a militarized government.

There should be some safe and rational way of organizing an efficient military organization for our practical needs. We think there is such a way. But that is another story.

#### **A Treaty for the American Republics.**

The fundamental ideas embodied in the proposed Pan American General Treaty were first suggested by Secretary Bryan, at the direction of President Wilson, to Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. Recently the matter has been presented not only to these three South American republics, but to all of the twenty South American republics. It is proposed to include these last mentioned republics also. The text of the treaty reads as follows:

**Article I.**—The high contracting parties agree to join one another in a common and mutual guarantee of territorial integrity under republican forms of government.

**Article II.**—To give definite application to the guarantees set forth in Article I, the high contracting parties severally agree to endeavor forthwith to reach a settlement of all disputes as to boundaries or territory now pending between them by amicable agreement or by means of international arbitration.

**Article III.**—The high contracting parties further agree (1) that all questions of international character arising between any two or more of them which cannot be settled by the ordinary means of diplomatic correspondence shall before any declaration of war, or beginning of hostilities, be first submitted to a permanent international commission for investigation, one year being allowed for such investigation, and (2) if the dispute is not settled by investigation, to submit the same to arbitration, provided the question in dispute does not affect the honor, independence, or vital interests of the nations concerned or the interests of third parties.

**Article IV.**—To the end that domestic tranquillity may prevail within their territory, the high contracting parties further agree not to permit the departure of any military or navy expedition hostile to the established government of any of the contracting parties and to prevent the exportation of arms and munitions of war destined to any person or persons in insurrection or revolt against the government of any of the contracting parties.

There have been objections, technical and otherwise, to certain aspects of this treaty. There are reasons for believing, however, that these objections will be overcome, or at least adjusted. As pointed out by Secretary Lansing, the United States not only formally disclaims any intention of invading the sovereignty of any of her neighbors, but further declares that this country, in truth, is unselfishly restricting the use of its own power for all times. The United States aims at one thing—the benefit that comes from continued peace and domestic tranquillity among nations living in proximity to each other, happy advantages, not of military aggression, but of civilization's peaceful pursuits.

### **WHY ONE SOLDIER WANTS PEACE**

**I**S THERE any hope for the establishment of a lasting peace after this war? Here is an answer from the trenches in Europe, where, it has been said, the real peace party exists. The London *Times* prints extracts from the diary of Private Becker, 6th Company of the Ersatz Battalion of the 3d Foot Guards, Landsturm, Professor of Latin at the Gymnasium of Bonn. We quote in part as follows:

#### **IN RUSSIA.**

**Aug. 2.**—On again. Exhausting march. Many bombarded villages, several completely destroyed. Bad food. Bad treatment of stragglers, especially of one-year volunteers.

Bad food, quite insufficient. Bad treatment of stragglers, insulting language. They are given extra guards. The officers lounge in carriages. The men are indignant at it.

**Aug. 3.**—March in burning heat through demolished villages. No water. All the wells are destroyed; cholera and flies. Loathsome dirt. It makes one weak. One dreams of fresh springs and wells. Brutishness.

**Aug. 4.**—March to Zamosz. I can go no farther. Always the same brutality of the N. C. O.'s towards the men who are going lame. Low spitefulness. Abuse.

**Aug. 6.**—Krasnostaw. I long for peace.

**Aug. 7.**—March of from 17 to 18 miles. Everywhere graves, bodies of horses, unburied or only half covered. . . . Flies, dirt. . . . One lives like a beast in the filth.

**Aug. 9.**—We are now three miles from the front.

The 3d Company has come back; all the men I knew in it